

REMARKS

Claims 1 to 20 are now pending in the application. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection(s) in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

DRAWINGS

The drawings stand objected to for certain informalities. Applicant has attached revised drawings for the Examiner's approval. In the revised drawings:

Attachment points 60, to attach replacement cover 40 to the power port assembly, were added to Figure 2 and 4 as suggested by the Examiner. Since the addition is consistent with, at least, page 10, paragraph 0028, first sentence, (existing bracketing and attachment points {e.g. mounting holes} are used), no new matter was added.

As noted previously, The Applicant requests that the proposed drawing change requested in the Response dated June 18, 2003 (which added reference number 53 to Figure 5) be withdrawn.

The Office Action asked if the Applicant intends the replacement sheets as formal drawings? The replacement sheets are intended to show proposed drawing corrections which the Applicant intends to formalize after the drawings are approved.

SPECIFICATION

A statement was added to the specification at Paragraph 0028 per the Examiner's suggestion with respect to showing the attachment means in the drawings. Additionally, the reference number 60 was added for designating the "existing attachment points."

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1 to 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable in view of Pritchard et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,222,124), Luu (U.S. Patent No. 5,384,428) and Thompson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,114,365). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

CLAIMS 19 AND 20

Regarding claims 1, 9, and 15 the Office Action states that it would have been obvious to minimize weight. Additionally, with regard to claim 19 and 20 the Office Action states that specific cover weights do not appear to be at issue. However, as discussed in MPEP 707.07(g) piece meal examination of the application should be avoided and each claim rejected (or allowed). The Applicant respectfully notes that since claims 19 and 20 remain pending they remain at issue. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests that claims 19 and 20 be Examined.

Moreover, regarding claim 19, as discussed in MPEP 2144.05 non obviousness of a claimed range may be established by showing the criticality of the range generally by showing unexpected results. The Applicant has reviewed Pritchard, Luu, and Thompson but has not noted any description of the weight of the wall plates (or connectors) or the results of reducing such weights, in these references. In contrast, the claimed invention recites an interface which weighs less than about 1.5 pounds, as set forth in claim 19. Importantly, recertification of the aircraft seat is not required because of this claimed weight range (see page 3, lines 5 to 11).

As is known in the art, recertification of devices on mobile platforms causes significant expenses and delays. In addition to neither teaching nor suggesting the claimed weight range, neither Pritchard, Luu, nor Thompson teach or even suggest that an interface which weighs less than about 1.5 pounds would not require recertification and its attendant expenses and delays. Accordingly, an interface which weighs less than about 1.5 pounds is less expensive, and allows for quicker replacement, than the devices disclosed in Pritchard, Luu, and Thompson.

The Office Action also states that once a Thompson or Luu cover is in place and certified it would be obvious to use such a cover as original equipment. However, as set forth above, neither Thompson nor Luu teach or even suggest (re)certification. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully believe that the use of the Thompson or Luu covers as original equipment is rendered moot.

Likewise, the Office Action also states that the manner of assembly cannot be relied upon. However, claim 19 incorporates a recital of a cover configured for attachment to existing certified structure. Thus, the claimed invention incorporates a recital of structure and does not claim a method of assembly.

Similarly, the Office Action states that the teachings of Thompson are applicable to aircraft power outlet boxes. However, as set forth above, and in the previous reply mailed June 18, 2003, Thompson neither teaches nor suggests either a weight range or the unexpected results provided by the claimed invention.

For the reasons set forth above, the Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 19 be reconsidered. For reasons similar to those set forth above regarding claim 19, the Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 20 also be withdrawn.

CLAIM 2

With regard to claim 2, the Office Action asks whether a replacement cover like that of Fig. 2 but with additional connectors mounted thereon is part of the intended invention? As claimed by claim 2, the invention includes a cover configured to about the same specifications as an existing cover and including a plurality of additional connectors. While the Office Action states that the specification should discuss such a cover, support for the cover is included at page 10 (last paragraph) to page 11.


The Office Action also states that no specific arguments were presented regarding claim 2 and therefore the rejection is maintained. The Applicant has diligently searched the previous Office Action, mailed March 18, 2003, without finding a specific rejection of claim 2. Accordingly, the Applicant submitted the June 18, 2003 response which met the rejections presented regarding claims 1 to 18 (in general) without a specific rejection of claim 2.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 10/20/07

By: 
Robert L. Villhard
Reg. No. 53,725

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600